4: Cross L-5 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavs E16

pean campaigns were inoculated with the republican ideas disseminated by the French revolution. Essentially patriotic, they were eager to apply these ideals to their own country, to abolish the autocracy, promote republican government, raise the standard of education, and do away with the abuses of serfdom They continued with greater energy, though often with little judgment, the task begun by Radishchev.

Here the Russian revolutionary movement begins among an enlightened fraction of the ruling class. Great writers like Pushkin and Lermontov, each after brief romantic digressions, grew up to treat the seamy side of reality, both in the tragedy of the humble who are scarcely considered human by those they serve, or the misfortune of the gifted individual denied a chance at productive activity by the contemporary organization of society. Both these talents were suspected and harassed by the autocracy, and though each met his death in a duel, they were as truly victims of official conservatism as those young enthusiasts who had participated in the Decembrist conspiracy in 1825 after the death of Alexander I, and paid for it on the scaffold or amid the snows of Siberia. But from 1825 the cleavage between the government and the thoughtful section of society, once opened, was never bridged again.

This mutual hostility first became acute during the reign of Nicholas I from 1825 to the Crimean War. The Decembrist conspiracy had revealed that the turn to the right by Alexander I after 1815 had created great bitterness. The same judicial and administrative abuses that marred Catherine's reign were still rampant, state finances were disordered, and the peasants were rudely exploited. Nicholas at first had some notion of reform, but his suspicion of extragovernmental initiative was such that he hesitated to take any concrete step. The most pressing problem was serfdom: the landlords were heavily in debt and short of capital to provide employment for a rapidly increasing peasant population. Peasant disorders were menacingly frequent, but only in the western Ukraine and in Poland were reforms introduced. Educational institutions were fettered and

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

national sentiment. It is not irrelevant to mention that the Orthodox Slavs of the Balkans are the least practising of Orthodox Christians, among whom it is the Serbs who have the largest number of unbelievers. It is said that, for a given number of inhabitants, there would be six times as many churches in Greece as in Serbia, four times as many in Rumania, and twice as many in Bulgaria.

Muscovite Slavism differed from Czech Slavism not only in its internal tendencies but in its psychological structure. The patient mysticism of the Russians aimed at achievements on the basis of a millenary evolution. The Czechs, of less nebulous mentality and of intense volitional power, sought immediate results. In Moscow they talked of the divine mission of Eastern Christianity; in Prague, of the boycotting of German goods and the disposal of the products of Czech industry. Between two nations with such a differing mental outlook, it was difficult to maintain concomitant moral action for very long.

The breach became apparent when the Czech, Karel Kramár, created the 'Neo-Slavism' which held its first Assembly in Prague in May, 1908. A Pole, Roman Dnowski, and a Bulgarian, Stevan Bobtchev, were in agreement with him to rejuvenate the old Slavonic ideal under a new climate. It was a doctrine tending towards cultural unity and the spiritual and economic collaboration of all Slavs, without distinction of religion, and on a footing of perfect equality. An anti-hegemonic conception of Slav solidarity thus replaced 'Russo-Orthodox-Panslavism', relegated to the order of romantic myths. It seemed to provide the positive basis and the practical aims which agreement among Slavs had always lacked.

But, among the other Slav peoples, this movement did not meet with the success its founder anticipated. Too many of these peoples still had to contend with foreign domination. Kramár more or less approved the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by the Dual Monarchy. He saw in it the legalisation of a state of things which implied an increase in the number, and therefore in the influence, of the Slavs within Austria-Hungary; it was for the inverse reason that the German Liberals in Austria had, thirty years earlier (1878), unleashed furious opposition to the occupation of these same provinces. But bound up with this question were the security and the independence of the Serbian

fy Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Chapter Seven

ORTHODOXY AND PANSLAVISM

IN the renewal of the spirit of Slavonic solidarity an important place must be attributed to the action of Orthodoxy.

The Muscovite Patriarchate, almost as soon as it was reconstituted on new juridical bases and assured of the Kremlin's support, set out to reconquer the communities who had relaxed their ties as a result of the Bolshevist Revolution, thereby renewing a Russian tradition which dates from Ivan III. The spiritual object of this pacific crusade was to restore union and harmony to the Orthodox or 'Pravoslav' world. But its political objective, though not openly avowed, was none the less obvious; the Moscow Government sought to extend its influence by having recourse to the 'armour of light' of which the Apostle speaks.

This campaign met with no canonical obstacle, since, among the Pravoslavs, there is no primacy of jurisdiction. But it *did* meet with resistance from the autocephalous 'national' tendencies of the various Orthodox Churches—tendencies which had been affirmed in the States created or enlarged by the First World War and in which the hierarchy had seized the opportunity of breaking away from the spiritual control of the Phanar (Constantinople Patriarchate).

But the weight of Soviet power enabled the Russian clergy easily to overcome the prejudices felt by the national Churches against any moral control exercised outside their State frontiers. For this purpose the clergy borrowed their arguments from the Muscovite temporal power, that is to say, they posed as champions of proletarian emancipation, and exploited the Orthodox Slavs' old prejudices against the Catholic Church. Whilst the Patriarch Alexis visited the Christian communities of the Middle East to restore the 'primacy of honour' of the Russian Church in the Orthodox Pentarchy (Moscow, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem), the Metropolitan Alexis of Juroslav went to the United States to try to rally the section of Orthodox emigrants who resisted the authority of the Patriarch of Moscow.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

stantinople, in agreement with the Muscovite hierarchy. The thousandth anniversary of the death of the anchorite, Saint John of Rila, restorer of Bulgarian monastic life, was the occasion, in May, 1946, of impressive solemnities which were attended by the Patriarch Alexis. It was the second time in ten centuries that the head of the Russian Church had visited the monastery. He officiated in person. The head of the Communist Party, George Dmitrov, took the opportunity of reminding the Bulgarian clergy that they should no longer look back towards the fallen régime :—

'Today we can ask that our Church shall remain faithful to her millenial traditions and become, in fact, a Republican Church, by ceasing to render homage to the dynasty and the monarchs who have betrayed the Bulgarian nation. Let our Fathers in the Holy Synod and all honest servants of the Church understand that today we are living in new times, that they must on no account thwart the aspirations of the people, and that they may take example from the chiefs of the Russian Orthodox Church'.

We can fully understand this warning only if we visualise the state of latent tension existing in the relations between the Church and the Bulgarian State since the liberation. It had shown itself, since the month of January, 1946, in a protest from the Exarch, Mgr. Stephan, against the prohibition of religious instruction in the schools. Since the new Constitution provided for the separation of the Churches and the State, the Bulgarian Holy Synod announced in December, 1946, that, while remaining hostile to this separation, it would nevertheless accept it if the Charter surrounded the exercise of the Church's spiritual mission with juridical guarantees. Moreover, it demanded that lay instruction should be neither anti-religious nor anti-Christian, but strictly neutral.

At the same time, in order to create conditions facilitating adaptation to the new state of affairs, it announced a programme of reforms destined to 'democratise' the internal régime of the Church and to bring its principles more in line with those of popular power.

So that, in Bulgaria, the separation did not appear as persecution; it was manifested rather by a strengthening of the autocephalous character of the Church, too closely bound up

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 659 with Bulgarian national life to be neglected by the new régime, which will continue to subsidise it, and counts upon its co-operation in rallying the masses; in which, moreover, it is assured of the goodwill of Mgr. Stephan and his clergy. On August 28, at the Bachkovo pilgrimage, Mgr. Cyrille, Metropolitan of Plovdiv, made a speech urging the faithful to vote, at the referendum, for the Republic and against 'the abhorred monarchy, whose role', he said, 'has been as fatal in the history of the country as in that of the Church'.

* * *

•185 Whereas, in the Balkan countries, the religious problem lay in getting the clergy to forget that they had, for some centuries, been the support of the monarchical institution, it had a quite different aspect among the Western Slavs, where the problem was, first and foremost, the liquidation of Uniatism.

175 795 648 As the reader will know, the 'Act of Union' (hence the word 'Uniat') was concluded three and a half centuries ago, in 1596, at Brest-Litowsk, where the Metropolitan of Kiev acclaimed the renewal with Rome of the Union of Florence. As a result, since that date there had been flourishing communities 'of the Oriental rite', which recognised Papal supremacy while keeping their national liturgy and their discipline—which, among other regulations, permits (as the Orthodox Church does) the clergy to marry. These communities today number in all about two million followers, especially in territories formerly incorporated in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

[829] Uniatism had always been regarded by the Russians as a 'turning movement' on the part of the Roman Catholic Church, supported first by Poland, then by Austria-Hungary, to detach the Orthodox from their traditional faith. Urban VII's apostrophe: 'Ruthenians, the East will be conquered by you!' has obsessed the Muscovite Church, which has never ceased to endeavour to recapture its positions.

After the fall of the Tsarist régime this Church's efforts were paralysed by the crisis she was herself experiencing, and by the official atheism professed by the Soviet State. The Holy See sought to take advantage of this crisis to restore the 'seamless robe of Christ'. It gave repeated proofs of solicitude, placing the Uniats on a footing of complete equality with their brethren of the Latin rite. It cherished the hope, thanks to these Uniats,

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

of one day seeing Slavonic Christianity return to Catholic unity, and the immense flock of all the Russians come back to the Roman fold. As is well known, the critical point in dogma is the divergence between the two Churches regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost. It is the famous 'Filioque' quarrel. Now, in the Liturgy published by the Holy See in June, 1943, for the use of the Russians and Ruthenians, the *Credo* is given according to the version of the early centuries, without reference to the 'Filioque'—in other words, ignoring the chief dispute which separated the Orthodox from the 'Romans'.

In spite of these concessions, Orthodoxy has never given up. In Carpatho-Ruthenia the number of its followers doubled from 1921 to 1930. Moscow had nothing to do with this; at that time it was the Serbian Patriarchate which presided over the destinies of the Russo-Carpathian Orthodox Church.[1]

And, after the incorporation of the Eastern Marches of Poland and of Carpatho-Ruthenia in the Soviet Union, a counter-offensive for the return of the Uniats to Orthodoxy was organised, using the customary resources of Russian political power. On June 18, 1945, a Committee of Initiative was formed, with a view to winning over these Catholics to Pravoslav unity. A 'Council' of the Uniat Church of the Western Ukraine was held in Lwow on March 8, 1946; it proclaimed the dissolution of ties which, for 350 years, had bound that Church to the Vatican,[2] and its submission to the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church. In the name of the delegates of the three Uniat Eparchies which were represented at the Council, a message was sent to Stalin announcing this decision, and the breaking of the spiritual bond between the Eastern Catholics and Rome.

The Bulletin of the Moscow Patriarchate[3] commented on this event as follows: 'So, gradually, day by day, in union and in united prayer, will the breach opened by Rome within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy be closed; the time is not far distant

[1] In 1921 the figures for Ruthenia were: Catholics 55,000; Uniats 332,500, and Orthodox 60,997.

[2] The anniversary of the connection was commemorated by the encyclical letter *Orientales omnes ecclesias*, published on January 19, 1946, in which the Pope accused the Russians of treating the Catholic Ruthenians as enemies of the State and encouraged the latter to persevere in their traditional faith.

[3] February 6, 1947.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

725 .165 648 [798]

when the word 'Uniat' will survive only as a historical idea'.

The Vatican published a note contesting the validity of this Council, recalling that part of the Catholic clergy of the Ukraine had been cast into prison; it saw, in the Lwow decision, the result of political pressure exercised by apostate priests.[4]

Nevertheless, the movement spread. The Patriarch Alexis, addressing the Uniats of Ukraine—formerly Poles or Czechs—put its development in the domain of political realities: 'You have always been united to Russia and her people by ties of language and of customs. Now that Divine Providence has restored to Russia her ancient frontiers, you are with us for ever'.

In any case the role of Uniatism as the vanguard of Catholicism in the Slavonic world seems to be, if not completed, at least paralysed for many a year, despite the resistance of part of the clergy and the support the dissentients can expect from the Catholic Ukrainians of Canada and the United States. The Bulletin of the Moscow Patriarchate[5] defined the lines on which the 'unification' is being carried on, by opposing the 'œcumenical spirit' to the 'imperialist spirit'. 'Universality is of God; Imperialism is of Cæsar. A new Orthodox era has been inaugurated by the rebirth of Western Orthodoxy at the great Council of Moscow; by the renewal of communion between the Russian Orthodox Church and her Eastern sisters; by the end of schisms and discords among the Orthodox (especially the reconciliation of the Bulgarian Church with Moscow, and the restoration of her rights to the autocephalous Georgian Church, brought into subjection to the Moscow Synod by the will of the autocratic Tsarist régime); by the journey of the Patriarch Alexis who, for the first time, went to pray at the Holy Sepulchre in 1945; and by the visit which the Metropolitan Nicolaï made to the Orthodox Christians of Western Europe'.

Indeed, Orthodoxy is driving its offensive towards the West,

[4] Radio-Moscow protested, in its turn, against this assertion, affirming that the Council represented 78% of the whole of the Uniat clergy. As for the bishops incarcerated before the meeting of the Council, these were, they said, traitors or accomplices of the German occupation. Cf., for the Catholic point of view on Moscow's policy regarding the Uniats, Charles Pichon: *Le Vatican*, in the series *Le Monde et l'Histoire* (Editions S.E.F.I.), pp. 396 *et seq.* According to Pichon only 5% of the Uniat priests had obeyed the Soviet injunctions.

[5] Of February 2, 1947.

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

beyond the territories placed within its traditional sphere of influence, and especially in Czechoslovakia.

It is true that the saints given to the Church by the Czech nation in the tenth century appear both in the Orthodox and in the Roman calendars, but Orthodoxy disappeared as an official religion in the twelfth century. However, its influence did not completely disappear; it still had a latent existence in the time of John Huss and his disciples, who established relations with the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1451—which relations were interrupted by the capture of the city by the Turks two years later.

With Joseph II's Edict of Tolerance in 1781, Orthodoxy, previously eliminated by the religious reaction known as the Counter-Reformation, re-established itself in Bohemia. We have related above (p. 24) the enthusiasm with which the people of Prague heard a Serbian prelate conduct an Orthodox service and pray for the soul of John Huss on the Wenceslas Square, on the occasion of the 1848 Slav Congress. In 1874 the use of the Catholic Church of Saint Nicholas was granted to the Orthodox cult, which thereafter worshipped in it concurrently with the National Church. After the Vatican Council, and in spite of the hostility of the Austrian authorities, conversions which created a great stir took place. But it was only after the First World War that the Orthodox Church was organised in Bohemia. Not being able, at that time, to attach itself to Moscow, it placed itself under obedience to the Serbian Patriarchate of Karlovtsi, which, in September, 1921, consecrated the first bishop. This Czech Orthodox Church was itself torn by the current of dissidence created by the 'Czechoslovak National Church', which claimed to be based on the ideas of John Huss, but was in reality far from being so. In 1929 the Patriarchate of Belgrade approved the constitution of an Orthodox Eparchy (Bohemia-Moravia-Silesia) in which divine worship was offered in liturgical Slavon and in Czech.

When the two Resistance heroes who were parachuted to deliver Bohemia from her torturer, the 'Protector', Reinhard Heydrich, had executed the latter,[6] they hid in the crypt of the

[6] The execution took place on May 27, 1942, on the outskirts of Prague, in a street which bore the symbolical name of Strossmayer. The practical details of the murder curiously resembled those connected with the

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

1947, by the delegates of the Communist Parties of nine European nations. It was then decided to set up a 'Joint Information Bureau' (*Kominform*), whose function would be to ensure organic liaison between these different parties, with a view to co-ordinating their activities and pooling their experience. A communiqué was broadcast on October 9 by the delegate of the Russian Communist Party, Idanov, a member of the Soviet Politburo. He contrasted the 'war-mongering' of the Western States with the 'pacifism' of the 'popular democracies' placed under the influence of the Soviet Union. He affirmed the mission of the Communist Parties to combat 'attempts at enslavement', the most dangerous form of which was, in Moscow's view, the Marshall Plan.

The seat of the new organisation, which was to publish a bi-mensual organ, was fixed in Belgrade. Its activities, in conformity with policy dictated by the Kremlin, aggravated the crisis in relations between East and West, and opened the period of tension to which the name of 'cold war' has been applied.

The Kominform is not a resurrection of the Komintern, dissolved in 1943. It is based, indeed, on the idea that the 'national' Communist Parties have reached a state of maturity and power which enables them to be henceforth regarded as autonomous on the plane of the common struggle against capitalist régimes.

The signatories to the Kominform's declaration were: Idanov and Malenkov (U.S.S.R.), Kardelj and Djilas (Yugoslavia), Tchervenkov and Poptomov (Bulgaria), Gheorghiu Dej and Anna Pauker (Rumania), Farkas and Revai (Hungary), Gomulka (Poland), Duclos and Fajon (France), Slanski and Bastovanski (Czechoslovakia), Longo and Reale (Italy).

The Kominform, controlled from Moscow, was rapidly to exert its activities in a domain which its promoters had not foreseen.

Indeed, Slav solidarity, already overtaken and superseded by the watchword of Marxist unity, was to suffer a still more serious set-back from the rupture between Tito and Moscow. It was in Belgrade that the Kominform had set up its seat; from Belgrade came the blow which was to shake its authority, and the dogma of Muscovite infallibility, in the whole of Eastern Europe.

1 [Delegate of Russian Communist Party, Idanov -- Analyst]

Gt Mouset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

The Yugoslav Government replied by trying, in Sarajevo, some White Russians, naturalised Soviet citizens, who, after having served the occupying authorities during the war, were said to have become agents for anti-Tito propaganda; on December 9 they were condemned to imprisonment for a term of years.

In the shade of Soviet-Yugoslav antagonism, the old quarrel between Belgrade and Sofia over Macedonia was reawakened.

Early in August, 1947, Tito and Dimitrov met at Bled and signed a protocol providing for closer collaboration between the two Governments: this protocol was to find its application in the 'pact of collaboration and mutual assistance' concluded on November 27 following, at Euxinograd.

Yet, at Bled, there were signs of disagreement. Tito would have liked to see the formation of a Federation of Southern Slavs. But such a federation would imply the inclusion of Bulgarian Macedonia in the Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia—which would have the effect of committing the Macedonians in Bulgaria to a policy for the future, on the lines of the old Serbian aspirations. Dimitrov shelved the solution of the Macedonian problem until the federal pact should be concluded. The Yugoslavs then insisted that psychological conditioning for the union should be ensured by the granting of 'cultural rights' to the Macedonians in Bulgaria. Now the Sofia Government refused to consider the latter as a minority, and therein lay the germ of the new Bulgarian-Yugoslav crisis.

Later, on December 20, 1948, after the Soviet-Yugoslav rupture, Blagoje Neskovitch, Vice-President of the Belgrade Government, was to claim that the quarrel unleashed by the Kominform arose simply out of the pressure brought to bear by the Bulgarian leaders, with a view to securing recognition of their territorial claims on Vardar Macedonia.

Then Belgrade reproached the Bulgarian Popular Republic with having refused a statute of autonomy and the designation of a 'nationality' to the Pirine Macedonians.

Thereafter the Macedonian Question remained in the forefront of Bulgaro-Yugoslav relations: a Macedonian, Poptomov, became Minister of Foreign Affairs in Sofia and, when Bulgaria denounced the pact of November 27, 1947, Yugoslavia accused her of violating the peace treaty by refusing to pay the repara-

65 Mousset H-6 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

described it as a 'crime against European civilisation', and on October 1 it was brought up at the Security Council by the French delegate, Parodi, during a discussion on Bulgaria's candidature for the United Nations. 648 696 829 175

In January, 1948, on the occasion of the signing of a treaty of mutual assistance with Rumania, the Bulgarian Premier, Dimitrov, risked an allusion to a project for the federation of the Balkan States, but this was immediately disavowed by the Kremlin. [185]

Dimitrov died on July 1, 1949; he was replaced as leader of the Government by Kolarov, and at the head of the Bulgarian Communist Party by his brother-in-law, Valko Tchervenkov.

The sentencing (March 8, 1949) of four Protestant pastors, accused of espionage, to life imprisonment, and the imprisonment of eleven others for a term of years, called forth vehement protests in the Christian world, and justified the sending of a diplomatic note by Great Britain, on March 12, in which these proceedings were described as a violation of Art. 2 of the peace treaty concerning 'fundamental liberties'.

The year 1949 was marked by progressive tension in the relations between Belgrade and Sofia. In September the Bulgarian Government denounced the treaty of friendship and, on October 6, the frontier agreement with Yugoslavia. This antagonism, which revived the Macedonian Question, reached a crisis at the trial of Traitcho Kostov, ex-Vice-President of the Council. Accused in March, by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, of 'flagrant errors' (the most serious accusation being that of having invoked the principle of State secrecy in order to withhold information of a commercial nature from representatives of the Soviet Union), Kostov found the charges gradually extended, until he was involved in a plot against the safety of the State, with the complicity of the Anglo-Americans and the agents of Tito. He was condemned to death, and executed on December 16. The Yugoslav press considered this charge as having been trumped up entirely with a view to compromising and discrediting Tito. 648 687 175 [208]

The municipal elections of May 15, 1949, gave the Communist-controlled Government of the 'Homeland Front' 92.1 per cent of the votes cast (370,000 blank votes); the legislative elections of December 18 raised this percentage to 666 175

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

666 175 98.89 per cent (110,180 blank votes), the electors having no other option than to vote for the 'Front' or to register a blank vote.

• 185 175 Faithful to the guidance of Benes, Jean Masaryk and Ripka, the Third National Front Government, presided over by Gottwald, endeavoured to secure the triumph of a policy of equilibrium between East and West, between Liberalism and Marxism. 'In our country', declared Benes, 'under the pressure of the masses, Communism has become national.'

648 175 The first signs of Soviet pressure were seen when, after the Czech Cabinet had decided, in July, 1947, to accept an invitation to attend the Paris Conference for the application of the Marshall Plan, it was forced, on orders from Moscow, to withdraw its acceptance.

[578] The final crisis was reached in February, 1948. An exceedingly violent press campaign was launched against Vaclav Nosek, Minister of the Interior, as the result of a purge which followed the discovery of illegal arms deposits. The Communist Party accused the National Socialists (Benes Party), the Popular Democrats and the Slovak Democrats of attempting to constitute an 'anti-Communist bloc' within the Government, and of paralysing the legislative power of the National Assembly. Tension reached its peak with the approach of the elections, then fixed for April 11, 1948.

668 642 175 The partisans of obedience to Moscow centred their efforts around the nucleus of the police and the trade union organisations. A 'Central Action Committee' was established, to back up, by mass movements, the offensive led by President Gottwald and his Communist colleagues against the moderate section of the Government. On February 20, 1948, the Ministers belonging to the three incriminated parties resigned. The Marxists held demonstrations in the streets; a political strike was declared on February 4, and the Congress of Works' Committees demanded the removal of the 'reactionaries'. President Benes, taken unawares by the suddenness of this attack, rejected the idea of a Government of Civil Servants and, on February 25, he formed a new National Front Ministry, with Gottwald as President, Gapotocki as Vice-President, Jean Masaryk at the head of Foreign Affairs. The Communists secured entire control of this Cabinet, which was in favour of unconditional collaboration with the Soviet Union. The opposition was reduced to